

he contended that what he had done was perfectly legitimate, the only question being whether he had so used his materials as to produce a substantial, harmonious result, and had infused into it the spirit of life, "If it were usual," he added, "to indicate one's authorities in a novel, I would willingly stud the bottom of my pages with foot-notes. And if a line from a fellow-writer remains intact in one of my pages, this simply proves that *I* am not hypocrite enough to hide iny borrowing, which it would be so easy to conceal"

In spite of that last remark there is reason to believe that, in the case of "Borne," Zola had a difficulty in wrestling with his mountain of "notes," and that when confronted by some memorandum made many months previously, he sometimes imagined its phraseology to be his own and not the actual language of one of his authorities. It seems quite likely that if the latter had been patent to him he would have paraphrased the memorandum, With respect to the actual principle for which he contended it is obvious that the novelist possessed of any conscientiousness ought often to read up certain subjects and consult a variety of authorities. It is indeed a pity that the practice is not followed more generally, for one would then be spared the thousands of blunders in elementary questions of law, science, history, precedence, titles, eta, which appear in so much contem-

porary fiction.

Zola's defence with respect to "Kome" will be found in a volume called "JSTouvelle Campagne,"<sup>1</sup> which contains a number of articles he contributed to "Le rigaro" in 1896. They are of all sorts. The first, on the opportunism of Leo 2III, foreshadows the denunciation of the Eoman Catholic

\* "Bdttvelk Campagae,"<sup>1</sup> Paris, E, fasquelie, 1897, 18mo, 296 pages.